DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 486 SP 006 768

AUTHOR Giles, Frederic T.
TITLE A Study of the Experiences of Washington Colleges and Universities in Implementing the 1971 Guidelines for Teacher Certification.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Guidelines; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Guides; Questionnaires; Research Utilization; *Teacher Certification

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the experiences of colleges and universities in implementing the 1971 Guidelines for Teacher Certification. The study was designed to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and major concerns that have resulted from the experiences of the colleges and universities; to collate the experiences into general statements, thus bringing the guidelines and their implementation into focus; and to report the results in a format usable by other agencies as well as the colleges. The method of study was an open-end questionnaire, the results of which were edited into general statements; the edited statements were approved by the institutions. Specific findings about strengths, weaknesses, and concerns were in the following areas: consortium development concept, implementation of the concept through program development, program approval procedures, and roles assumed by various preparation agencies. (JA)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE CO

A STUDY OF THE EXPERIENCES OF WASHINGTON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE 1971 GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION *

Conducted by
Frederic T. Giles
Dean, College of Education
University of Washington
February, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 080486

Since there has been over a year in which to gain experience in implementing the 1971 Guidelines, the colleges and universities were interested in assessing these experiences in order to gain directions for future development.

PURPOSES OF STUDY

The purposes of the study were:

1. to identify the strengths, weaknesses and major concerns which have resulted from the experiences of the colleges and universities.

2. to collate the experiences of all colleges and universities into general statements, rather than by institutions, thus focusing on the Guidelines and their implementation, rather than the idiosyncrasies of the institutions.

3. to report the results in a format useable by other agencies as well as the colleges.

METHOD OF STUDY

Each college and university completed an open-end questionnaire indicating their experiences. These responses, based on approximately sixty consortia experiences, were then compiled and edited into representative statements which cover the individual institution strengths, weaknesses and concerns. These edited statements were sent to all institutions for their approval or suggested change.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The following statements are based on the experiences of the Washington colleges and universities in attempting to implement the 1971 Guidelines for Teacher Certification:

CONSORTIUM DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

Strengths

--The concept provides for a broad participation of individuals involved in teacher preparation.

--The concept provides an open-system approach which allows for inputs from diverse groups at various stages of development.

* *see Appendix I to this study*

--The concept, based on the parity principle, insures an equal voice among agencies.

--The concept requires that responsibility for program development be spread across a broad base of participants.

--The concept increases the role of the teacher education faculty within the college or university.

--The concept defines the responsibility for a systematic evaluation of programs.

--Planning is more diverse than was the case when it was done by the colleges in isolation. Key people from each agency permit implementation to occur more quickly.

--Performance objectives are good; however, most departments were working with those under old program, as well as getting inputs from outside.

--Definition of objectives and evaluation by performance are good aspects of the consortium concept.

Weaknesses

--The concept is extremely complex. It requires the establishment of a base of knowledge before developmental activities can begin.

--The concept, as it is currently defined, cannot become fully operational until further definition is given to provide a linkage between the development group (policy board) and the established policies and procedures for the three agencies.

--The concept does not clearly define the responsibilities of each of the participating agencies. There is no management system included for the assignment of accountability to any one of the participants.

--The concept does not clarify the number of persons who should represent each agency.

--The concept provides little or no provision for the coordination of each agency. It does not provide directions for resolving the question of reciprocity among consortia, out-of-state applicants, etc.

--The concept encourages duplication of effort since many consortia are developing programs in the same area.

--The concept is extremely demanding in time and effort. Even when released time can be arranged, many teachers are reluctant to leave their students with substitutes.

--Teacher education will have to become the central business of the institution. This will be difficult to achieve.

--Hundreds of hours seem necessary for anything to happen.

--New guidelines seem to have been based on the prediction that greater numbers of teachers are needed. No revision has been made in light of present employment conditions.

--There is a tendency to perpetuate status-quo, since outside agencies are not demonstrating, in most cases, leadership in improving teaching.

--No provisions have been made for someone to be held accountable for the quality of the experience. This needs to be spelled out more clearly.

--The concept is costly. Colleges and universities will require additional funding to operate it.

--The concept is not equally applicable to rural and urban settings.

--The concept provides a quasi-legal description of consortium members. This tends to move planning from a programmatic concern over to a political or power base.

--The concept does not provide a definition of roles for the school and college personnel in initial and continuing certification programs.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--Guidelines are too vague. Too much is left for interpretation by each group.

--Provisions should be made for longer periods of planning time than are now available through afternoon or evening sessions.

--The roles of the various consortium agencies should be defined according to responsibilities each should have for the different levels of certification. This idea implies a change in the concept with respect to the parity principle as now defined.

--Implied costs are beyond the resources of the institution.

--Most appropriate course of action would be to redirect current efforts toward a pilot model approach.

--No evidence exists that the new guidelines will produce better teachers. It is a higher cost program, both in time and money, that doesn't guarantee better results than are possible in the 1961 Guidelines.

--Proliferation of programs should be controlled.

--The policy board has no fiscal support or legal status. This needs changing.

--Funds should be made available for small pilot projects to develop tools for performance criteria.

--The specialized professional organizations and groups from the academic disciplines should have a stronger role in the process.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT THROUGH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Strengths

--Input and review by all participating agencies should provide a more relevant program.

--Accountability has been introduced as a criterion in monitoring teacher preparation programs.

--Clarification of means versus ends must be considered in teacher education.

--Priorities are reordered to put highest value on the success of the candidate.

--Competency-based approach to certification is a real strength. It is possible that it can be directed to the improvement of education for elementary and secondary students.

--A strong emphasis is placed on evaluation of the competence of the individual candidate.

--Preparation occurs where the learning is most relevant.

--Those who have roles in developing a program are more likely to use it than they would if it were forced on them.

--A strong potential for innovation exists.

Weaknesses

--Agencies do not have clearly defined responsibility for program development. Evidence to date suggests that teachers do not have the time and there is some question as to the degree of interest required for the intensive effort required in planning the pre-service and in-service components.

--Competency-based teacher education is threatening to many college and school personnel. They do not feel that they themselves are competent in the standards expected of the candidates.

--Competency-based teacher education is extremely demanding of time, energies, and resources. Communication is critical to the success of the concept and this requires extensive provisions of resources.

--The state of the art is not sufficient to prepare the tools, techniques, and personnel required for the evaluation of criterion-referenced performance.

--One of the greatest potential weaknesses of the 1971 Guidelines lies in program development. The Guidelines represent what it has taken

150 years of effort to get away from in teacher training (domination by facts, prescriptions, and narrow specializations).

--There is no provision for program development since the whole package must be complete before anything can happen.

--Greater number of people or groups involved in making decisions tends to slow the process.

--There was a lack of adequate longitudinal studies prior to embarking on this approach.

--There seems to be serious confusion relative to roles and responsibilities in the "umbrella consortium" approach.

--There are no provisions for funding faculty or clerical staff for time required.

--There is already an inability of professional people to develop and manage behaviorally-stated criteria in teacher training.

--The management system required for successful operation requires time and personnel not available in present budgets.

--There is a great potential for maintaining the status quo as a result of programs that are geared to current practices in the field.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--Responsibilities for each participating agency must be clearly defined.

--The manner in which professional subject-matter organizations are to be involved must be determined.

--The section on the standards dealing with program approval should be strengthened to insure that there is some expertise involved in the review of definitions of competency strategies, and criteria for judging performance.

--The absence of emphasis on content achievement, and no degree requirement should be corrected.

--Definite responsibilities should be assigned to each agency for the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

--The college degree is not required and thus, there is a real danger that it may become a thing of the past. Narrow preparation at the expense of a liberal education may well result unless this omission is corrected.

--The 1961 Guidelines contain all of the advantages of the 1971 statement without the disadvantages contained in the 1971 edition.

PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCEDURES

Strengths

--Program approval by the State Office and State Board of Education should provide some assurance of program quality.

--Procedures provide for continuing evaluation of programs.

--Procedures emphasize a positive approach. Emphasis is on improvement of programs rather than on minimum program standards.

--Each agency to be involved participates in program approval procedures.

--The approval process has the potential to implement the participatory spirit of the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

Weaknesses

--The tremendous variety of programs will make extremely difficult, if not impossible, any application of uniform criteria in evaluating programs.

--The vast variety of programs to be approved will require much time and costly effort.

--The procedures by which program approval will be granted or denied have not been developed.

--The by-laws developed by a local umbrella consortium suggest that the group will exercise program evaluation separate from the state. How will this be coordinated?

--There seem to be instances where parity seems to be impossible to attain. Where does one go from there?

--Criteria for program approval lack specificity.

--There is no assurance that program approval committees will have the expertise to do a competent job.

--Competency-based programs will require greater expenditures of time by visiting committees than do the 1961 Standards. There are no funds available for this.

--Program approval procedures are designed to evaluate programs as submitted by each consortium. The 1961 Standards evaluated programs on an institutional basis. This means that the 1971 procedures will require approval of far more programs. This will incur greater costs.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--A more definitive procedure for program approval must be worked out.

--Expertise in the competency-based program concept (to include evaluation of criteria to be applied) must be identified and funding provided for their services.

--This approach makes the S.P.I. the complete dictator of teacher education. The funding required for state level monitoring is not available.

--Minimum standards for program approval should be provided.

PROVISIONS FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Strength

--Provisions operationalize a partnership process that draws on the strengths of three as opposed to one agency in the management of teacher education.

--Each consortium can establish its own management system.

--Decisions can be made close to the action.

--Management can develop in terms of needs.

--The provisions allow the strong to come forward and manage.

Weaknesses

--Planning for program management requires some experience with a coalition or partnership model. When this is lacking, planning groups tend to move into program planning at the expense of working out carefully provisions for program management.

--The 1971 Guidelines and Standards provide no directions or provisions for program management.

--There is no locale identified for program management.

--Smaller institutions are jeopardized because of sheer numbers of persons required to provide management. These are not available.

--Since each consortium may vary its system, those with vested interest may take over, even though not qualified to do the task.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--Where the great strength of the guidelines seems to be in the provision of a partnership approach to teacher education, the great weakness lies in the absence of any provisions for a management system necessary for the operation of the partnership concept. This contradiction must be corrected if the guidelines are to operate successfully.

--The Guidelines need to incorporate provisions for a management system. The "examples" now contained in the appendix relegate the importance of management to the lowest priority possible.

--The State Superintendent of Public Instruction will have to provide the leadership necessary for the development and inclusion of a management system within the 1971 Guidelines and Standards.

--The level of funding necessary for management (once this is defined) must be provided by the state.

--Consideration should be given to the channeling of funds for management (once established) through colleges and universities for the sake of systematization.

--There should be a clear definition of standards and regulations which clarify state board policy in addition to sections on guidelines and procedures which offer suggestions for implementation to participating groups.

ROLES ASSUMED BY VARIOUS PREPARATION AGENCIES

Strengths

--While stressing parity in the influence structure, the Guidelines encourage each agency to assess its strengths and weaknesses and base its role on the results of such assessment.

--Role definitions for each agency are expected to be the outgrowth of shared planning and agreement among the three agencies.

Weaknesses

--Successful participation by the agency in consortia activity requires the participant to thoroughly understand the parameters of his agency's legal role and function.

--Agency role responsibilities impose a problem on consortium planning procedures since the policy board frequently must refer decisions back to a given agency for decision due to legal constraints under which that agency operates.

--Agency role statements do not delineate the responsibilities for each role.

--Considerable responsibility has already shifted to the professional associations who are neither staffed nor can provide qualified staff without necessary funding to participate in the development of teacher education programs.

--Roles may be assumed by default due to failure of any one agency to fund its operation sufficiently.

--Subject matter professional organizations are overlooked in role assignment by agencies.

--The definition of "professional association" is poorly defined. Subject matter professional organizations are not included in the definition.

--Specific role responsibilities for agencies are not provided.

--With consortium funding coming from the S.P.I., there will be more centralization of control in the 1971 Standards than was true in the 1961 Standards.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--A matrix for assignment of agency role responsibilities should be provided within the 1971 Guidelines. To provide examples in the appendix is not enough.

--A matrix of agency role responsibilities such as the one in Appendix "B" should be made available in the consortium planning stage. Very few people have a perspective of role that cuts across and includes three agencies.

--A clearer statement on initiating programs is needed.

--In any case, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should move quickly to modify the 1971 Guidelines to include provisions that clarify agency roles and responsibilities.

ROLE AND RELATIONSHIP OF OFFICE OF STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Strengths

--The State Superintendent's budget request includes requests for additional funding for the implementation of the Guidelines.

--The role of expeditor and mediator among agencies is an appropriate role.

--The role is outlined.

--The S.P.I. representative in the Spokane area functions effectively in consortium development.

Weaknesses

--The role is not clearly defined.

--The manner in which funds are to be used in the implementation of the Guidelines is not given.

--The S.P.I. should assume more authority than it has in the past. This authority is needed to expedite initial programs.

--There is a lack of emphasis on the S.P.I. role for "policing" responsibility.

--S.P.I. is unable to provide answers to significant questions.

--S.P.I. has demonstrated a reluctance to consider any validity to the concerns and reservations expressed by higher education institutions.

--S.P.I. participation to date has been mainly an "observer role;" a more responsible service is needed.

--S.P.I. proceeded to launch a massive effort without an adequate logistic base to fund and allocate human and physical resources required to do the job.

--There has been too much turnover in field representation provided by S.P.I.

--1971 Guidelines tend to be too ambigious about what the S.P.I. will or will not accept.

--Each consortium is allowed to start from scratch in development of minimum performance criteria.

--The S.P.I. has not provided sample criteria or provided any model for the task.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--The specific responsibilities of the State Superintendent and the manner in which funds are to be allocated for implementation of the Guidelines need to be designated.

-- The S.P.I. role needs to be clearly defined in its "partnership" relationship in the development, implementation, evaluation and enforcement of the 1971 Guidelines.

--Increased S.P.I. leadership role is needed.

--A few selected pilot programs should be funded throughout the development, implementation and evaluation stages to determine the viability of the consortium as a vehicle for preparation and certification of teachers on a statewide basis.

APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES TO ADMINISTRATOR AND/OR ESA PERSONNEL
(e.g., administrators, counselors, school nurses, etc.)

Strengths

--Causes a careful re-examination of expected competencies and relationship of knowledge as it is related to performance and performance quality.

--Encourages (and provides vehicle for) training institutions and public schools to work more closely and to recognize joint responsibilities and contributions.

--Provides alternate opportunities for learning, for expanding practicum experiences not now available.

--Enables the individual who is specializing, the opportunity to focus both academic and practicum preparation on the field of his specialty within the setting (school) in which he expects to be employed.

--Involvement of the school and professional organizations should assist in the development of a more relevant program.

--The general equality and comparability of the Guidelines is probably a healthy thing as these relate to all three types of educational personnel.

--There is a broad participation of teachers and others.

--There is an emphasis on the needs of the school rather than on the specialist's definite roles.

--Emphasis on shift from "required courses" to performance criteria is good.

Weaknesses

--The consortium concept fails to:
  a. identify authoritative, administrative responsibilities and financial support,
  b. identify the particular ESA staff as the representative members of the planning body, program designers, etc., and,
  c. designate major role to specialized professional organizations.

--There is a failure to recognize professional and ethical standards recognized by special professional associations. These, for the most part, are considerably higher than those on the state level.

--There is a lack of adequate funding to permit planning, program design, field testing and re-design before a program is submitted for approval.

--There is a vast duplication of efforts among a relatively small group of people. The clumsy consortia arrangements have prevented a statewide development of programs to improve services to all school children.

--The professional association to represent each group is not clearly designated. In certain areas, such as administrators and school nurses, the locale has relatively few members available.

--Since there was no certificate for ESA personnel in the 1961 Guidelines, ESA programs have been hurriedly developed to conform with the 1971 Guidelines. ESA personnel should not be forced into certification programs that have not been adequately developed and tested.

--There are not restrictions on types of ESA Personnel to be certified, nor are there restrictions on who does so. How about training superintendents in college-district consortia; or training principals in a community college-district consortia?

--The deadline is very near for ESA consortia models. In the absence of adequate funding even to sustain interim procedures, it poses a real problem for the future.

--There is no evidence to show that the new program is an improvement over the existing one.

--Final decisions can be made without the approval of the specialized professional association.

Concerns Worthy of Serious Consideration for Change

--Failure to provide extension of 1961 Guidelines for ESA personnel places these in a discriminatory position.

--Lack of commitment of W.E.A. and school districts to ESA preparatory programs (developed by consortia) is serious.

--Arbitrary 1973 deadline for ESA certification is bad when it has been impossible to get consortia moving.

--Power struggles of the negotiating professional association (W.E.A.) and its lack of genuine concern for professional preparation of ESA staff is serious.

--Increased staff is needed to coordinate, evaluate, and individualize programs.

--Competency-based guidelines do not account for the critical behavior of decision making. The degree to which effective decision making takes place is not demonstrated by an easily defined behavior.

--Consideration should be given to the possibility of statewide institutional and agency cooperative arrangements for program development.

--Specialized professional organizations should be included in the decision-making process for consortia.

APPENDIX I

The following is from the "Guidelines and Standards for Development and Approval of Program of Preparation to the Certification of School Professional Personnel" adopted by the State Board of Education July 9, 1971.

Introduction

The basic purposes of State Board of Education guidelines and standards for preparation leading to certification has always been to ensure the competence of common school professional personnel.

* * *

To further these objectives, the guidelines and standards provide for colleges/universities, professional associations and school organizations to form consortia to plan and carry on preparation programs. Each of the three agencies in a consortium is to have an equal voice in overall planning, policy formation, assignment of responsibilities, evaluation of programs, and the hearing of appeals.

* * *

The guidelines and standards establish a framework whereby the objectives of preparation are determined; competencies in subject matter specialities, pedagogy, and personal characteristics are delineated; and entry and exit-level competencies for each stage of preparation are specified.

* * *

The guidelines and standards proceed naturally from developments in teacher education over the past twenty-five years and emphasize the following principles:

a. preparation should be related to performance and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his clients;

b. preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style;

c. preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected; and

d. preparation is a career-long, continuing process.

A. CERTIFICATION

1. Three types of certificates are provided:

   a. The teacher certificate authorizes service in the primary role of teaching.

   b. The administrator certificate authorizes service in the primary role of general school administration, program administration and/or supervision.

   c. The educational staff associate certificate authorizes service in roles of specialized assistance to the learner, the teacher, the administrator and/or the educational program.

2. Three levels of certificates are provided for each certificate type:

   a. The preparatory certificate authorizes experiences in school or school-related settings designed to develop competence at the "initial" level of certification. This certificate is valid for one year and is renewable.

   b. The initial certificate authorizes school service in a particular role and allows the holder to assume independent responsibility for working with children, youth and adults. This certificate is valid for three years and is renewable once.

   c. The continuing certificate authorizes school service on a career basis and assumes continued professional development. The continuing certificate is valid as long as the holder continues in service. It is subject to renewal only if the holder leaves educational service for a period in excess of four years.

TYPES AND LEVELS OF CERTIFICATES
(Figure 1)

Types of Certificates	Teacher	Administrator	Educational Staff Associate
Levels of Certificates ↑	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
	Initial	Initial	Initial
	Preparatory	Preparatory	Preparatory

3. Certificate endorsements

Initial and continuing certificates will be endorsed to indicate grade level(s), content area(s), and/or specialization(s) for which the professional is or has been prepared.

4. Reciprocity

a. In-state candidates:

1) Holders of initial certificates shall be admitted to programs leading to continuing certification.

2) Holders of provisional certificates or credentials awarded under previously adopted State Board of Education rules and regulations may be admitted to programs leading to continuing certification, provided they meet entry level requirements.

3) Holders of standard certificates or of valid teacher certificates issued prior to 1949 may be admitted to programs leading to initial or continuing certification, provided they meet entry level requirements, without jeopardizing their prior certification status.

b. Out-of-state candidates:

Candidates holding out-of-state certificates or credentials shall have the option of applying for certification under either these 1971 standards or under those previously adopted.

1) Graduates of institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, or graduates of out-of-state four-year institutions accredited for teacher education, who hold or are eligible for comparable certificates in another state, territory or possession of the United States, may be granted temporary certificates with appropriate endorsements.

2) Graduates of accredited out-of-state institutions who do not meet the requirements cited above and who wish Washington certification shall be required to meet requirements established by a consortium of institutions and agencies with approved preparation programs in the state.

3) Experienced persons who hold certificates from other states and have been granted temporary certificates may apply for initial or continuing certification to in-state consortiums of agencies with approved programs as soon as they are employed in Washington. These consortiums shall have procedures which ensure fair and prompt assessment of the applicant's qualifications and shall make appropriate recommendations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding certification of the applicant.

B. CONSORTIUM OF AGENCIES DEFINED

Under these standards preparation programs are to be developed and implemented by a consortium of agencies. Each agency will designate its own representative(s) and clarify with that (those) representative(s) his (their) authority in acting in behalf of the agency. The agencies in a consortium shall be colleges and universities, school organizations and professional associations in accordance with the following definitions:

1. Professional Association: The professional association, determined by the total faculty of certificated employees in a school organization in accordance with election procedures defined in Chapter 28A.72 RCW (or a cooperative group of such associations if a number of school organizations have combined to participate in a consortium for staff development purposes) shall have the professional association responsibility in a consortium and shall have the responsibility of providing opportunity for input from all other specialized and subject matter associations.

2. School Organization: Any public or independent school system or district or cooperative group of such organizations shall have the school organization responsibility in a consortium. School organizations should represent the interests of parents, interested citizens, school children and youth, the local school board(s) and the school administration, including principals. As a consequence, individuals representing school organizations shall have responsibility for providing opportunity for input for those various groups in developing and implementing personnel preparation policies. The chief administrator(s) of school organization(s) is(are) responsible for designating the individual(s) responsible for the school organization's role in program development and implementation.

3. University/College: Any institution of higher learning or cooperative group of colleges/universities which has or develops professional teacher education programs shall have the college/university responsibility in a consortium. Community colleges (in collaboration with four-year institutions) may participate in preparation. Colleges/universities should represent the interests of students and of academic, professional and administrative faculties. Individuals representing colleges/universities and community colleges should reflect the interests and talents of those various groups in program development and implementation. The chief administrator for professional preparation and development as designated by the college or university president is responsible for providing the opportunity for representatives from the appropriate departments or interest groups of the college or university to carry out the institution's role in program development and implementation.

C. CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS

Preparation for school professional personnel is subject to approval by the State Board of Education. The State Board will approve a program of preparation if it meets the following criteria:

1. Consortium arrangements.

The consortium shall:

a. File with the Superintendent of Public Instruction a letter of intent to form a consortium for preparation.

b. Specify the arrangements and processes it will use to:

1) formulate policy;
2) develop program objectives, elements, and characteristics;
3) gain input and involvement of students and citizens in model development;
4) implement the program;
5) administer the program, including monitoring candidate progress, reporting and recommending certification, recommending certificate endorsements, etc.;
6) conduct annual program review and evaluation.

c. Arrange for and report results of at least one comprehensive outside evaluation during the three to five years between periodic program approval by the State Board of Education.

d. Give evidence that it has the human and material resources to conduct, to implement, and to arrange for evaluation of the preparation program.

2. Development of preparation opportunities and alternatives.

The consortium shall:

a. Describe the role or roles which are to be assumed by the person who is to be granted a specific certificate with a particular endorsement.

b. Describe and state the rationale for the competencies (knowledges, attitudes, skills, etc.) required of persons who plan to perform the described roles.

c. Describe examples of the kinds of experiences that will be provided to assist each candidate develop or demonstrate the required levels of competencies.

d. Describe the procedures which ensure that each candidate participates in the design of his own program and the procedures which enable the candidate to achieve certification at his own rate of demonstrable accomplishments.

e. Specify examples of kinds of evidence that will be used to determine acceptable entry and exit levels of competence of the candidate; including, as appropriate, evidence of competence when working with clients.

f. Describe examples of procedures which will be used to provide positive, growth-producing feedback to the candidate and to the program.

g. Describe examples of the kinds of experiences and resources that will be available to staff development personnel, both school and college, to assist them to develop necessary competencies and carry out responsibilities of their roles and specify procedures which ensure that those who supervise the candidate's preparation are competent.

h. Provide assurances that the program is of high professional quality by describing program elements which ensure that a candidate will have appropriate breadth and depth of knowledge for his expected role and which allow and encourage the candidate's continued personal and professional development.

i. Describe the procedures and arrangements which ensure continuing career development opportunities for persons holding initial and continuing certificates.

D. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

1. State Board of Education. Programs of preparation are subject to State Board of Education review and approval. The State Board of Education:

a. Applies the standards hereinbefore set forth in WAC 180-80-720 in approving programs.

b. Receives notification from the Superintendent of Public Instruction of letters of intent to establish preparation consortiums.

c. Receives and acts upon recommendations from the Superintendent of Public Instruction concerning the review of requests of consortiums for program approval.

d. After initial approval, reviews and approves annual progress reports and comprehensive outside evaluations filed by each consortium.

e. Reviews and approves comprehensive studies of each consortium's program(s) on a three-to five-year schedule.

2. Superintendent of Public Instruction.

a. Approval-accreditation function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1) Arranges for on-site visitations to review each consortium's programs for consequent recommendations to be submitted to the State Board of Education.

2) In reviewing programs considers:
(a) published programs and descriptions made by the agencies within a consortium;
(b) reports of visitations to agencies of the consortium by state staff members;

(c) annual progress reports submitted by the consortium and the reports of the interim, comprehensive evaluation;
(d) reports of special visitations to consortiums which may be arranged;
(e) accreditation and approval status of colleges/universities and school organizations.

b. Certification function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction issues certificates and makes certificate endorsements upon recommendation of a consortium of agencies operating an approved program of preparation.

c. Improvement-leadership function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1) assists colleges/universities, school organizations and professional associations in program development leading to State Board approval;

2) assists or facilitates communication and collaboration among and between agencies;

3) arranges for advisory committees of the State Board to meet, make site visits, and prepare reports for the State Board of Education;

4) selects each year one phase of teacher education or staff development for special study and focuses the attention of personnel in consortiums on this phase. (An example of such a phase would be selection of candidates and entry competencies.)

5) requests financial resources needed to achieve preparation and staff development objectives.

E. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES

The issuance of teacher, administrator and educational staff associate certificates shall be effective September 1, 1971.